



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vizginia 22313-1450 www.nspto.gcv

APPLICATION NO /	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/403,543	10/25/1999	TATSUYA SHIMODA	104270	7425	
25944 . 759	90 07/03/2003				
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320		. •	FOONG, SUK SAN		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2823		
			DATE MAIL ED: 07/03/2003	DATE MAIL ED: 07/03/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,		Application No.	oplicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		09/403,543	SHIMODA ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Suk-San Foong	2823				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
Period fo	• -						
THE N - Exten after: - If the - If NO - Failui - Any re	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Isions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) do will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDON	timely filed ays will be considered timely. m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 J	<u>lune 2003</u> .					
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 1955 C.D. 11,	400 O.G. 210.				
4)⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are rejected.						
7)🖂	Claim(s) 8,9 and 21 is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
	on Papers						
,	The specification is objected to by the Examine		aminor				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.							
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
•	☑ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:						
,	1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.	•				
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).							
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.							
15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.							
Attachmen	t(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other:							

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/2/03 has been entered.

Claim Objections

- 2. Claim 21 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 3, as noted in paragraph 1 of the Office Action mailed 2/10/03. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).
- 3. In view of applicant's arguments bridging last paragraph on page 6 and first paragraph on page 7 or paragraph under section II, the objection is withdrawn.
- 4. Claims 8 and 9 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or

Application/Control Number: 09/403,543

Art Unit: 2823

rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The steps recited in claims 8 and 9 are recited in claim 1, lines 8-10.

Page 3

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi 7. ('585) in combination with Vu et al. ('124).

Hayashi and Vu et al. are relied on for the teachings discussed in the rejections of paragraph 8 of the Office Action mailed on 2/10/03 and as follows.

The combination process does not disclose forming a plurality of electrodes on first and second thin film device layers.

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 09/403,543

Art Unit: 2823

Hayashi discloses his invention as an improvement over the prior art at Col. 1, lines 62-68.

Hayashi discloses a prior art method of forming three-dimensional devices having multiple layers of semiconductor devices which includes forming a first and second semiconductor substrates wherein each of the first and second substrates includes a device layer with a plurality of electrodes and then stacking the first and second semiconductor substrates together with the corresponding plurality of electrodes (Col. 1, lines 14-35).

It would have been within the scope to one ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of the combination process with Hayashi's prior art to enable flexibility and circuit design and enable circuits to be formed.

Applicant has not seasonably contested the subject matter of the Official Notice.

Therefore, the object of the well-known statement is taken to be admitted prior art (MPEP 2144.03).

Response to Arguments

- 8. The additional teachings of Vu et al. as discussed by applicants do not negate those relied on.
- 9. Applicant argues that Vu et al. does not disclose transferring second device layer onto first device layer with a plurality of electrodes from on each of the layers. However, it is not necessary for the reference to teach the entire process.

m the

Page 5

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suk-San Foong whose telephone number is 703-305-0383. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Olik Chaudhuri can be reached on 703-306-2794. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 (7724, 3431, 3432).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

47 June 26, 2003

> George Fourson Primary Examiner Art Unit 2823